



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,787	06/08/2000	John Buckle	0007056-0017/P4811/RSB	1504

32658 7590 06/17/2004
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEEN ST.
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/589,787

Applicant(s)

BUCKLE, JOHN

Examiner

Matthew Heneghan

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 13 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 22 April 2004 has been entered.

2. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended in response to the previous office action. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,687,836 to Butler in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,312 to Dustan et al.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, and 17, the system disclosed by Butler has a password entered twice in response to a user error (caused by the user's uncertainty). Identifiers are generated and displayed as words from the hashes of the respective passwords. (see column 3, lines 1-20).

Though Butler discloses a system having only 16,384 possible check words (see column 9, lines 3-25), Butler discloses that the check list may be enlarged, since, if a check list is too short, then the odds become too great that a mistyped password will map to the same check word (see column 8, lines 28-33). Therefore, the algorithm may be modified such that the check word combinations become unique.

The invention of Butler may be implemented on any one of a number of types of systems, but Butler does not explicitly disclose an implementation on a server (see column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 4).

Dustan discloses a method for securely accessing information wherein the original text of the password is stored only on a database server (such as a web server sending HTML pages), and the authentication information for a user is checked against the stored password in the database server (see column 7, line 53 to column 8, line 37 and column 8, line 55 to column 9, line 17). Dustan further suggests that an unauthenticated security system allows access to one of the disparate data sources by

anyone having access to a web server and may allow one user to break into another's session (see column 2, lines 25-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed by Butler by storing passwords on a database server, such as a web server, as disclosed by Dustan, in order to prevent a user from breaking into another's session.

As per claims 2, 9, and 16, Franklin discloses that a decision is made depending upon whether or not the password has changed. (see column 3, lines 20-24)

As per claims 4, 11, and 18, the password inputs and outputs constitute data fields.

As per claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, and 21, a strategy is disclosed for editing the passwords in the case of an error (see column 9, lines 30-42).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6, 13, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Since Butler bases the unique identifiers upon a hash of the passwords, it

becomes impossible to implement the invention of Butler such that the output would be the same length as the input.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see Paper No. 14, filed 16 December 2003, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive, due to the additional limitations introduced in the amendments of claims 1, 8, and 15. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,836 to Butler as detailed above.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,134,661 to Topp discloses a system for encrypting characters in password entry as they are typed.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Heneghan whose telephone number is (703)

Art Unit: 2134

305-7727. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM - 4:00 PM Eastern Time. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 2, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MEH



June 4, 2004



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100